arXiv:1402.6161v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 25 Feb 2014

Observation of the Second Triatomic Resonance in Efimov's Scenario

Bo Huang (黄博)[1], Leonid A. Sidorenkov[1,2], and Rudolf Grimm[1,2]
[1]*Institut für Experimentalphysik, Universität Innsbruck, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria and*
[2]*Institut für Quantenoptik und Quanteninformation (IQOQI), Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

Jeremy M. Hutson
Joint Quantum Centre (JQC) Durham/Newcastle, Department of Chemistry, Durham University, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, United Kingdom
(Dated: February 26, 2014)

We report on the observation of a three-body recombination resonance in an ultracold gas of cesium atoms at a very large negative value of the *s*-wave scattering length. The resonance is identified as the second triatomic Efimov resonance, which corresponds to the situation where the first excited Efimov state appears at the threshold of three free atoms. The observation, together with a finite temperature analysis and the known first resonance, allows the most accurate demonstration to date of the discrete scaling behavior at the heart of Efimov physics. We obtain a scaling factor of 21.1(1.4), close to the ideal value of 22.7.

PACS numbers: 03.75.−b, 21.45.−v, 34.50.Cx, 67.85.−d

Efimov's scenario of three resonantly interacting bosons [1, 2] is widely known as the paradigm of universal few-body quantum physics. Its bizarre and counterintuitive properties have attracted a great deal of attention. Originally predicted in the context of nuclear systems, Efimov states are now challenging atomic and molecular physics with strong links to quantum many-body physics [3]. Experimentally the famous scenario remained elusive until experiments in an ultracold gas of Cs atoms revealed first signatures of the exotic three-body states [4]. A key point for the experiments is the precise control of two-body interactions enabled by magnetically tuned Feshbach resonances [5]. With advances in various atomic systems [6–17] and theoretical progress in understanding Efimov states and related states in real systems [3, 18], the research field of few-body physics with ultracold atoms has emerged.

Three-body recombination resonances [19] are the most prominent signatures of Efimov states [2, 20]. They emerge when an Efimov state couples to the threshold of free atoms at distinct negative values of the *s*-wave scattering length a. The resonance positions $a_-^{(n)}$ are predicted to reflect the discrete scaling law at the heart of Efimov physics, following $a_-^{(n)} = 22.7^n a_-$. Here $n = 0$ refers to the Efimov ground state and $n = 1, 2, ..$ are related to excited states. The starting point a_- of the infinite series, i.e. the position of the ground-state resonance, is commonly referred to as the three-body parameter [16, 21–24].

For an observation of the second Efimov resonance, the requirements are much more demanding than for the first one. Extremely large values of the scattering length near $a_-^{(1)}$ need to be controlled and the relevant energy scale is by a factor $22.7^2 \approx 500$ lower, which requires temperatures in the range of a few nK. So far, experimental evidence for an excited-state Efimov resonance has been obtained only in a three-component Fermi gas of ^{6}Li [11], but there the scenario is more complex because of the involvement of three different scattering lengths. Experiments on bosonic ^{7}Li have approached suitable conditions for a three-boson system [7, 25, 26] and suggest the possibility of observing the excited-state Efimov resonance [26].

In this Letter, we report on the observation of the second triatomic resonance in Efimov's original three-boson scenario realized with cesium atoms. Our results confirm the existence of the first excited three-body state and allow the currently most accurate test of the Efimov period. Moreover, our results provide evidence for the existence of universal N-body states linked to the excited three-body state.

Two recent advances have prepared the ground for our present investigations. First, we have gained control of very large values of the scattering length (up to $\sim 10^6\, a_0$ with a_0 being Bohr's radius), which in ultracold Cs gases is possible by exploiting a broad Feshbach resonance near 800 G [21, 27]. Precise values for the scattering length as a function of the magnetic field can be obtained from coupled-channel calculations based on the M2012 model potentials of Refs. [21, 28]. Second, Ref. [26] has provided a model, based on an S-matrix formalism [29, 30], to quantitatively describe finite-temperature effects on three-body recombination near Efimov resonances. While for the first Efimov resonance, experimental conditions can be realized practically in the zero-temperature limit, finite-temperature limitations are unavoidable for the second resonance and therefore must be properly taken into account.

Our experimental procedure of preparing an ultracold sample of cesium atoms near quantum degeneracy is similar to the one reported in Refs. [21, 31]. In an additional stage, introduced into our setup for the present work, we adiabatically expand the atomic cloud into a very weak and shallow trap. The latter is a hybrid with optical confinement by a single infrared laser beam and magnetic confinement provided by the curvature of the magnetic field [32]. The mean oscillation frequency $\bar{\omega}/2\pi$ of the nearly isotropic trap is about 2.6 Hz. This

very low value corresponds to a harmonic oscillator length of $\sim 5\mu$m, which is about a factor of five larger than the expected size of the second Efimov state. Our ultracold atomic sample consists of about $N = 3 \times 10^4$ Cs atoms at a temperature of 7 nK and a dimensionless phase-space density of about 0.2. We probe the atomic cloud by *in-situ* absorption imaging near the zero crossing of the scattering length at 882 G. We obtain the in-trap density profile and the temperature T assuming the gas is thermalized in a harmonic trap.

To study recombinative decay for different values of the scattering length a, we ramp the magnetic field from the final preparation field ($\sim$820 G) [32] down to a target value (between 818 G and 787 G) [33] within 10 ms. After a variable hold time t, between tens of milliseconds and several seconds, we image the remaining atoms. The maximum hold time is chosen corresponding to an atom number decay of about 50%. In addition to the resulting decay curves $N(t)$ we record the corresponding temperature evolution $T(t)$. Recombinative decay is known to be accompanied by heating [32, 34], which needs to be taken into account for analyzing the data.

For extracting recombination rate coefficients from the observed decay curves, we apply a model that is based on the general differential equation for α-body loss in a harmonically trapped thermal gas,

$$\frac{\dot{N}}{N} = -L_\alpha \alpha^{-3/2} \left(\frac{N}{V}\right)^{\alpha-1}, \qquad (1)$$

with the volume $V = \left(2\pi k_B T/m\bar{\omega}^2\right)^{3/2}$. The factor $\alpha^{-3/2}$ arises from the spatial integration of the density-dependent losses.

Since three-body recombination is expected to dominate the decay, we fix α to a value of 3, numerically integrate Eq. (1) over time and fit the measured atomic number evolution with L_3 and the initial atom number N_0 being free parameters. In cases where there are significant contributions from higher-order decay processes, e.g. four-body decay, the fitted L_3 can be interpreted as an 'effective' loss coefficient [35] that includes all loss processes. Considering a typical temperature change of about 50% during the decay, a slight complication arises from the fact that L_3 itself generally depends on T, while our fit assumes constant L_3. To a good approximation, however, we can refer a fit value for L_3 to a time-averaged temperature $T_{\rm avg}$ [32] .

Figure 1(a) shows our main result, the recombination resonance caused by an excited Efimov state. Here we plot the fit values obtained for L_3 as a function of a normalized inverse scattering length $22.7a_-^{(0)}/a$. We set $a_-^{(0)} = -963a_0$, as obtained from a new finite-temperature analysis [32] of the data in Ref. [21]. With the chosen scale, the second Efimov resonance would appear at $22.7a_-^{(0)}/a = 1$ for a T=0 sample that perfectly follows the Efimov scenario. Our sets of measurements (A: blue squares and B: red circles) [32] have been taken on different days with similar trap frequencies but slightly different average temperatures $T_{\rm avg}$ of 7.7(1.5) nK and 9.6(6) nK [32]. Our results exhibit a loss peak around



FIG. 1. Observation of the second triatomic Efimov resonance. In (a), we show the effective three-body loss coefficient L_3 as a function of normalized inverse scattering length $22.7a_-^{(0)}/a$ (see text). Blue squares and red circles are two sets of measurements taken with slightly different trap settings. The error bars include statistic uncertainties from numerical fitting. The black solid line is the theoretical calculation of L_3 (based on the parameters of the first Efimov resonance) at 8.65 nK (average temperature of two sets) while the gray-shaded region corresponds to the temperature range between 7.7 and 9.6 nK (see text). In (b), the fitted loss index α shows a larger deviation from a value of 3 in the regions (gray-shaded) away from the second Efimov resonance (white region, where $\alpha < 3.5$), indicating contributions from higher-order recombination processes.

$22.7a_-^{(0)}/a = 1.3$ ($\sim$797 G), which is a clear manifestation of the second Efimov resonance. The peak shift is expected as a consequence of the temperature limitation of the loss, which also explains why this resonance is not as pronounced as the first Efimov resonance observed before at 15 nK [21].

In order to compare our results with theoretical predictions, we use the finite-temperature model of Ref. [26] with the two resonance parameters, position $a_-^{(0)} = -963a_0$ and decay parameter $\eta_-^{(0)} = 0.10$ [32], independently derived from previous measurements on the first Efimov resonance. For the temperature we use $T_{\rm avg}$= 8.65 nK, which is the mean value for both sets. The agreement between our present results and the independent theoretical prediction (black solid line in Fig. 1(a)) is remarkable, which highlights the discrete scaling behavior of the Efimov scenario. To illustrate the effect of temperature uncertainty on the calculated L_3, we also plot the gray-shaded area in Fig. 1(a), where the lower and upper boundaries are calculated with $T_{\rm avg}$ of set B and that of set A,



FIG. 2. Fits to the second Efimov resonance. The two sets of measurements are the same as displayed in Fig.1, but limited to the resonance region and with one clear outlyer removed. Also the black solid line is the same. The fits to the sets A and B are plotted as blue dashed and red dotted lines respectively.

respectively. We find that the temperature uncertainty mainly results in an amplitude error rather than an error of peak position.

The measurements on the 'shoulder' of the resonance ($22.7a_{-}^{(0)}/a > 2.2$ in Fig. 1(a)) show a broad increase of the effective L_3 as compared to the expectation from the three-body loss theory (black solid line in Fig. 1(a)). Since similar enhanced loss features have been observed near the first Efimov resonance earlier [7, 25, 36–38] and explained by the presence of four- or five-body states associated with an Efimov state, we attribute this feature to higher-order decay processes. To check this, we fit set B [39] with Eq. (1) as discussed above, while now using α as an additional free parameter. The fit results for α are shown in Fig. 1(b). In the region close to the Efimov resonance (white region II), where we indeed expect dominant three-body behavior, the value of α is relatively close to 3 [40]. On the 'shoulder' of the Efimov peak (gray-shaded region III), a significant increase of α, compared to the resonance region, confirms the existence of higher-order decay processes. It is interesting to note that the relatively broad shoulder that we observe for the higher-order features is in contrast to the narrow features observed in ^{7}Li [7, 25]. On the other side of the Efimov resonance (gray-shaded region I), we also observe an enhancement of α, which is likely to be caused by similar higher-order decay features associated with highly excited N-body cluster states.

To analyze the observed resonance in more detail, we zoom into the peak region of Fig. 1(a). This reveals that the peak position indicated by our measurements slightly deviates from the one of the theoretical curve (black solid line) based on the parameters of the first Efimov resonance. This suggests that the position of the second Efimov resonance at zero temperature, $a_{-}^{(1)}$, may not be exactly equal to $22.7a_{-}^{(0)}$. To extract an experimental value for $a_{-}^{(1)}$, we now fit the results in the resonance region ($0 \leq 22.7a_{-}^{(0)}/a \leq 2.6$) with the finite-temperature model. Because the temperature uncertainty effect on L_3 (gray-shaded area in Fig. 1) is significantly larger than the typical error in measured L_3, we use the temperature as an additional free parameter for the fitting. The results of the fits (blue dashed and red dotted lines in Fig. 2 for sets A and B) are summarized in the upper part of Table I and yield a mean $a_{-}^{(1)}$ value of $-20400(800)a_0$, where the error range includes the uncertainties from the fit and the statistical errors of the two sets.

Set	T/nK	$a_{-}^{(1)}/a_0$	$\eta_{-}^{(1)}$	λ
A	9.8(4)	-21000(400)	0.13(2)	1*
B	10.5(4)	-19800(600)	0.18(2)	1*
A	7.7*	-20600(400)	0.17(3)	0.52(5)
B	9.6*	-19700(400)	0.19(4)	0.80(7)

TABLE I. Fitted parameters for the second Efimov resonance. The upper part of the table shows the fitting results when no amplitude scaling of L_3 is applied and temperature T is a free parameter, while the lower part corresponds to fixed-temperature fitting with λ being a free amplitude scaling factor (see text). The uncertainties indicate 1σ errors from fitting. The symbol * indicates that the corresponding parameter is kept fixed.

A deviation in the L_3 amplitude between theory and the experimental results can possibly arise from errors in atom number calibration resulting from imaging imperfections and errors in trap frequency measurements. To account for these effects, we follow an alternative fit strategy and introduce an additional parameter λ as an amplitude scaling factor for L_3 into the finite-temperature model while assuming that the temperature is determined precisely. We now fix the temperature at the measured $T_{\rm avg}$ and fit the experimental results to extract the corresponding parameters for each set (lower part of Table I). Remarkably, this alternative approach gives a mean value of $-20200(600)a_0$ for $a_{-}^{(1)}$, which is consistent with the one extracted before. This shows the robustness of our fit in determining $a_{-}^{(1)}$, and we get the mean value of $a_{-}^{(1)}$ with statistical errors as $-20300(800)a_0$.

Another significant contribution to our error budget for $a_{-}^{(1)}$ stems from uncertainty in the M2012 potential model [21, 28] that provides the mapping between the measured magnetic field B and the scattering length a. To quantify this, we have recalculated the derivatives of all the experimental quantities fitted in Ref. [28] with respect to the potential parameters, and used them to obtain fully correlated uncertainties in the calculated scattering lengths at the magnetic fields $B = 852.90$ G and 795.56 G, corresponding to the two Efimov loss maxima, using the procedure of Ref. [41]. The resulting scattering lengths and their 1σ uncertainties are $a_{-}^{(0)} = 963(6)\ a_0$ and $a_{-}^{(1)} = 20300(1000)\ a_0$. These values accord well with the uncertainty in the position of the Feshbach resonance pole, which was determined to be 786.8(6) G in Ref. [28] with a 2σ

uncertainty.

Taking all these statistical fit uncertainties into account, we get $a_-^{(1)} = 20300(1300)a_0$ and $a_-^{(0)} = 963(11)a_0$, and we finally obtain $a_-^{(1)}/a_-^{(0)} = 21.1(1.4)$ for the Efimov period. This result is consistent with the ideal value of 22.7 within a 1.2σ uncertainty range. The trend towards a lower value is also consistent with predictions for finite-range corrections to the first Efimov resonance [42–44]. On a more quantitative level universal van der Waals theory [45] applied to our situation indeed predicts the spacing between the first and the second resonance to be reduced by 5-10% from the ideal value.

Note that additional systematic uncertainties may slightly influence our experimental determination of the Efimov period. Model-dependent deviations in the previous fit to various interaction-dependent observables in Cs [28] may somewhat affect the $a(B)$ mapping from magnetic field to scattering length. The applied finite-temperature model [26], employing the zero-range approximation, may be influenced by small finite-range corrections. Moreover, confinement-induced effects may play an additional role even in the very shallow trap [46, 47]. While an accurate characterization of these possible systematic effects will require more efforts, we estimate that our error budget is dominated by the statistical uncertainties.

For determining the Efimov period, previous experiments in ^{40}K [6] and ^{7}Li [7, 25] have considered recombination minima for $a > 0$, from which values of $25(4)$ and $16.0(1.3)$ can be extracted, respectively. There the lower recombination minima serving as lower reference points appear at quite small values of the scattering length (typically only at 3 - 4 times the van der Waals length $R_{\rm vdW}$ [5]), so that substantial quantitative deviations from Efimov's scenario, which is strictly valid only in the zero-range limit $|a|/R_{\rm vdW} \to \infty$, may be expected. In our case the lower reference point $a_-^{(0)}$ is at about $-9.5\,R_{\rm vdW}$ (with $R_{\rm vdW} = 101a_0$ for Cs) [21–24], which makes the situation more robust. In general, features at negative scattering length appear to be less sensitive to corrections as no weakly bound molecular state is involved [48]. Another difference between our work and previous determinations of the Efimov period is the character of the Feshbach resonance, which in our case is the most extreme case so far discovered of an entrance-channel dominated resonance, where the whole interaction can be reduced to an effective single-channel model [5]. The resonances exploited in ^{40}K and ^{7}Li have intermediate character, where the interpretation is less straightforward.

In conclusion, our observation of the second triatomic recombination resonance in an ultracold gas of Cs atoms demonstrates the existence of an excited Efimov state. Together with a previous observation of the first resonance and an analysis based on finite-temperature theory, our results provide an accurate quantitative test of Efimov's scenario of three resonantly interaction bosons. The character of the extremely broad Feshbach resonance that we use for interaction tuning avoids complications from the two-channel nature of the problem and brings the situation in a real atomic system as close as possible to Efimov's original idea. The value of $21.1(1.4)$ that we extract for the Efimov period is very close to the ideal value of 22.7 and represents the most accurate demonstration of the discrete scaling behavior at the heart of Efimov physics. Our results challenge theory to describe accurately the small deviations that occur in real atomic systems as a result of the finite van der Waals interaction range.

New possibilities for Efimov physics beyond the original three-boson scenario are opened up by ultracold mixtures with large mass imbalance [49]. The ^{133}Cs-^{6}Li mixture, where the Efimov period is reduced to a value of 4.88, has been identified as a particularly interesting system [50, 51]. A very recent preprint [52] indeed reports the observation of three consecutive Efimov resonances.

We thank D. Petrov for stimulating discussions and for providing the source code for the finite-temperature model. We further thank B. Rem, C. Salomon, Y. Wang, P. S. Julienne and J. Levinsen for fruitful discussions and M. Berninger, A. Zenesini, H.-C. Nägerl, and F. Ferlaino for their important contributions in an earlier stage of the experiments. We acknowledge support by the Austrian Science Fund FWF within project P23106.

[1] V. Efimov, Phys. Lett. B **33**, 563 (1970).
[2] E. Braaten and H.-W. Hammer, Phys. Rep. **428**, 259 (2006).
[3] A. S. Jensen (editor), Few-Body Syst. **51**, 77-269 (2011).
[4] T. Kraemer, M. Mark, P. Waldburger, J. G. Danzl, C. Chin, B. Engeser, A. D. Lange, K. Pilch, A. Jaakkola, H.-C. Nägerl, and R. Grimm, Nature **440**, 315 (2006).
[5] C. Chin, R. Grimm, P. S. Julienne, and E. Tiesinga, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1225 (2010).
[6] M. Zaccanti, B. Deissler, C. D'Errico, M. Fattori, M. Jona-Lasinio, S. Müller, G. Roati, M. Inguscio, and G. Modugno, Nature Phys. **5**, 586 (2009).
[7] S. E. Pollack, D. Dries, and R. G. Hulet, Science **326**, 1683 (2009).
[8] N. Gross, Z. Shotan, S. Kokkelmans, and L. Khaykovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 163202 (2009).
[9] J. H. Huckans, J. R. Williams, E. L. Hazlett, R. W. Stites, and K. M. O'Hara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 165302 (2009).
[10] T. B. Ottenstein, T. Lompe, M. Kohnen, A. N. Wenz, and S. Jochim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 203202 (2008).
[11] J. R. Williams, E. L. Hazlett, J. H. Huckans, R. W. Stites, Y. Zhang, and K. M. O'Hara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 130404 (2009).
[12] N. Gross, Z. Shotan, S. Kokkelmans, and L. Khaykovich, Phys. Rev. Lett **105**, 103203 (2010).
[13] T. Lompe, T. B. Ottenstein, F. Serwane, K. Viering, A. N. Wenz, G. Zürn, and S. Jochim, Phys. Rev. Lett **105**, 103201 (2010).
[14] S. Nakajima, M. Horikoshi, T. Mukaiyama, P. Naidon, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett **105**, 023201 (2010).
[15] G. Barontini, C. Weber, F. Rabatti, J. Catani, G. Thalhammer, M. Inguscio, and F. Minardi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 043201 (2009).
[16] S. Roy, M. Landini, A. Trenkwalder, G. Semeghini, G. Spagnolli, A. Simoni, M. Fattori, M. Inguscio, and G. Modugno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 053202 (2013).
[17] R. J. Wild, P. Makotyn, J. M. Pino, E. A. Cornell, and D. S. Jin,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 145305 (2012).
[18] Y. Wang, J. P. D'Incao, and B. D. Esry, Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **62**, 1 (2013).
[19] B. D. Esry, C. H. Greene, and J. P. Burke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1751 (1999).
[20] F. Ferlaino, A. Zenesini, M. Berninger, B. Huang, H.-C. Nägerl, and R. Grimm, Few-Body Syst. **51**, 113 (2011).
[21] M. Berninger, A. Zenesini, B. Huang, W. Harm, H.-C. Nägerl, F. Ferlaino, R. Grimm, P. S. Julienne, and J. M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 120401 (2011).
[22] J. Wang, J. P. D'Incao, B. D. Esry, and C. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 263001 (2012).
[23] P. K. Sørensen, D. V. Fedorov, A. S. Jensen, and N. T. Zinner, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052516 (2012).
[24] R. Schmidt, S. Rath, and W. Zwerger, Eur. Phys. J. B **85**, 1 (2012).
[25] P. Dyke, S. E. Pollack, and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 023625 (2013).
[26] B. S. Rem, A. T. Grier, I. Ferrier-Barbut, U. Eismann, T. Langen, N. Navon, L. Khaykovich, F. Werner, D. S. Petrov, F. Chevy, and C. Salomon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 163202 (2013).
[27] M. D. Lee, T. Köhler, and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 012720 (2007).
[28] M. Berninger, A. Zenesini, B. Huang, W. Harm, H.-C. Nägerl, F. Ferlaino, R. Grimm, P. S. Julienne, and J. M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032517 (2013).
[29] V. Efimov, Sov. J. Nuc. Phys. **29**, 546 (1979).
[30] E. Braaten, H.-W. Hammer, D. Kang, and L. Platter, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 043605 (2008).
[31] M. Berninger, *Universal three- and four-body phenomena in an ultracold gas of cesium atoms*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Innsbruck (2011).
[32] See Supplemental Material for details on sample preparation and density and temperature determination, for additional information on the two sets of results and for an updated fit of the L_3 data obtained previously [21] for the first Efimov resonance.
[33] The magnetic field range between 787 and 818 G corresponds to a range of scattering lengths between -10^5 and -2600a_0.
[34] T. Weber, J. Herbig, M. Mark, H.-C. Nägerl, and R. Grimm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 123201 (2003).
[35] J. von Stecher, J. P. D'Incao, and C. H. Greene, Nature Phys. **5**, 417 (2009).
[36] F. Ferlaino, S. Knoop, M. Berninger, W. Harm, J. P. D'Incao, H.-C. Nägerl, and R. Grimm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 140401 (2009).
[37] A. Zenesini, B. Huang, M. Berninger, S. Besler, H.-C. Nägerl, F. Ferlaino, R. Grimm, C. H. Greene, and J. von Stecher, New J. Phys. **15**, 043040 (2013).
[38] R. J. Fletcher, A. L. Gaunt, N. Navon, R. P. Smith, and Z. Hadzibabic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 125303 (2013).
[39] We use only set B for this purpose, because it contains more data at different hold times and therefore the fit converges better when both L_α and α are free in the fitting procedure.
[40] The small deviation from $\alpha = 3$ in region II can be explained by the heating effect, which leads to somewhat faster decay in the initial stage and a somewhat slower decay at the end of the hold time. This mimicks higher-order loss.
[41] D. L. Albritton, A. L. Schmeltekopf, and R. Zare, in *Molecular Spectroscopy: Modern Research, Vol. II*, edited by K. N. Rao (Academic Press, 1976).
[42] J. P. D'Incao, C. H. Greene, and B. D. Esry, J. Phys. B **42**, 044016 (2009).
[43] L. Platter, C. Ji, and D. R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 022702 (2009).
[44] M. Thøgersen, D. V. Fedorov, and A. S. Jensen, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 020501(R) (2008).
[45] Y. Wang and P. S. Julienne, Private communication.
[46] S. Jonsell, H. Heiselberg, and C. J. Pethick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 250401 (2002).
[47] J. Levinsen, P. Massignan, and M. M. Parish, arXiv:1402.1859.
[48] A. Zenesini, B. Huang, M. Berninger, H.-C. Nägerl, F. Ferlaino, and R. Grimm, To be published.
[49] J. P. D'Incao and B. D. Esry, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 030703(R) (2006).
[50] M. Repp, R. Pires, J. Ulmanis, R. Heck, E. D. Kuhnle, M. Weidemüller, and E. Tiemann, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 010701 (2013).
[51] S.-K. Tung, C. Parker, J. Johansen, C. Chin, Y. Wang, and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 010702 (2013).
[52] S.-K. Tung, K. Jimenez-Garcia, J. Johansen, C. V. Parker, and C. Chin, arXiv:1402.5943.